

**REMARKS****Summary of the Final Office Action**

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0030672 to Honda et al. (hereinafter "Honda").

Claims 4-6 are allowed.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants have amended claim 1 in order to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application. Accordingly, claims 1-6 remain currently pending and under consideration.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Honda. Applicants have amended claim 1 in order to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application. To the extent that the rejections might be deemed to still apply to the claims as newly-amended, they are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that while Honda is similar in some general respects to embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application, Applicants note that there are significant differences between the disclosure of Honda and the disclosure and claims of the instant application. For example, in embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application, each single field is divided into a plurality of continuous subfields. Each of these subfields has a single light-emission period. Applicants respectfully submit that during the light-emission

period, light emission takes place continuously as illustrated in Figs. 3 and 4 of the instant application. On the other hand, Applicants respectfully submit that that Honda's disclosure teaches that there are no light emission periods NE in some subfields, as indicated in Figs. 24A to 24D of Honda.

Accordingly, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to describe a combination of features of a display device including a display panel in which each field of an image signal is divided into a plurality of continuous subfields, each said subfield includes an emission period during which light emission induced by sustain discharge takes place continuously." Claim 1 goes on to describe that the display panel includes a plurality of pixel cells for each pixel, and grayscale display is performed by selectively causing emission in the pixel cells based on the image signal for each of the subfields.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that, in each emission period, light emission is induced continuously. In other words, the light emission takes place without interruption. Applicants note that this makes dither noises indistinctive. As a result, a high quality display can be attained.

In Honda's arrangement, on the other hand, the light emission is induced intermittently. As a result, Applicants respectfully submit that the dither noises are distinctive and observable to a viewer. As a result, the quality of the displayed image is degraded by such dither noises.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn because Honda does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 1, as amended. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." Thus, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art

reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)." Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 2 and 3 are allowable at least because of their dependence from newly-amended claim 1, and the reasons set forth above.

The Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 4-6 are allowed.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing discussion, Applicants respectfully request the entry of the amendments to place the application in clear condition for allowance or, in the alternative, in better form for appeal. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution. A favorable action is awaited.

**EXCEPT** for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including

any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0573.

This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

**DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP**

Dated: March 15, 2007

By:



Paul A. Fournier

Reg. No. 41,023

**Customer No. 055694**

**DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP**

1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100

Washington, DC 20005-1209

Tel.: (202) 842-8800

Fax: (202) 842-8465